



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,493	12/30/2004	Gianfranco Maris	Q85644	5393
23373	7590	03/25/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			SCHIFFMAN, BENJAMIN A	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			4191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/519,493	MARIS, GIANFRANCO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN SCHIFFMAN	4191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are pending in the instant application.
2. Claim 10 has been canceled as indicated by applicant in the amendment submitted on 23 December 2008.
3. The amendments/arguments submitted 22 July 2008 and 23 December 2008 have been entered and fully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1-3 and ~~6-9~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plamthottam et al (US 4,906,421) in view of Tynan (US 4,028,302). Deleted: 7
6. Regarding claims 1, PLAMTHOTTAM ET AL teaches mixing tackifying resins (see column 11 line 26-29) to a composition comprising a rubber (see column 4 line 48-50) and solvent (see column 7 line 50-54) in a twin, analogous to dual, screw extruder (see abstract). The tackifying resin may be alpha pinene (column 13 line 55), which is a hydrocarbon.
7. PLAMTHOTTAM does not appear to expressly disclose wherein at least a fraction of the solvent is added at a point of the extruder that is downstream of the initial section at which the rubber and the resin is added; or that at the outlet of the extruder the temperature of the composition produced by dissolving the other ingredients rubber and resin in the solvent being less than the boiling point of the solvent.

8. However, TYNAN teaches a process for the production of a composition comprising mixing a polymer (see Fig. 1 at 6) and a solvent (see Fig. 1 at 9) in a twin-screw extruder (see Fig. 1 at 1; see also column 3 line 37-42). The solvent is introduced at a point downstream the initial section of the extruder (see Fig. 1 at 11). In addition, the temperature of the composition (see Table 1) is kept below the boiling point of the solvent (see column 5 line 46-49), i.e. less than 150 °C.

9. At the time of invention, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of mixing rubber of PLAMTHOTTAM to include the downstream addition of the solvent as well as the temperature of the outlet of TYNAN, in order to eliminate the formation of agglomerates with a slow heating process (see TYNAN column 2 line 63-68) of an intimately mixed cold slurry.

10. Regarding claims 2-3, Tynan teach an extrusion device with a diameter of 83.2 mm, i.e. 83 mm + 0.2 mm (see column 6 line 7-9). The solvent is injected in three streams (plurality of different point) at points 515mm, 645mm, and 755 mm from the upstream end of the device.

11. Regarding claim 6, Plamthottam discloses a rubber based pressure sensitive adhesive, specifically the rubbers can be natural, isoprene based rubbers (see US 3,932,328 abstract), or synthetic, nonisoprene based rubbers (see US 4,152,231 abstract) (both incorporated into Plamthottam by reference see column 5 lines 5-23).

12. Regarding claim 7, Plamthottam et al. teach adding tackifying resins to a composition comprising a rubber and solvent as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1.

Deleted: Tynan teach a composition comprising mixing an acrylonitrile polymer. Acrylonitrile polymer is a natural or synthetic rubber as evidenced by Hall (US 4,178,337; see column 3 line 47-57).

13. Regarding claim 8, Plamthottam et al. teach adding tackifying resins (see column 11 line 26-29) to a composition comprising a rubber (see column 4 line 48-50) and solvent (see column 7 line 50-54). The solvent used may comprise hexane (see column 7 line 62-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use hexane as the solvent in the method by Tynan in view of Plamthottam et al. because Plamthottam et al. teach hexane reduces the viscosity of the composition so that it may be easily handled in bulk (see column 7 line 64-66).

14. Regarding claim 9, Tynan teaches rotating the screw elements at the same time, i.e. co-rotate (see column 4 line 9-11).

15. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plamthottam et al. in view of Tynan as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Burbank et al. (*Producing adhesives and sealants with a twin-screw. Adhesives & Sealants Industry.* June/July 1998. Vol. 5 Issue 5, p. 44).

16. Regarding claim 4, Plamthottam et al. teach heating the composition from 8°C and 160°C (see claim 7). Plamthottam et al. are silent regarding keeping the portion of the extruder upstream of the solvent addition point between 60°C and 120°C and keeping the portion of the extruder downstream of the solvent addition point between 40°C and 80°C. Burbank et al. recognize temperature is a very important process variable (see p. 4 and p. 5) in the continuous compounding of compositions to produce adhesives and sealants with a twin-screw extruder (see Title). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention without undue experimentation to determine optimum temperature range of the extrusion process in the method by Plamthottam et al. in view of Tynan because Burbank et al. teach that that temperature is a process variable which controls the quality of an adhesive produced (see p. 5 paragraph 5-7). "Discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art." *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

17. Regarding claim 5, Plamthottam et al. in view of Tynan teach every claimed limitation except adding the tackifying resin (hydrocarbon resin) at a point of the extruder downstream the initial section. Burbank et al. teach adding tack resins at successive locations downstream the initial section (see p. 3 last two paragraphs; see also p. 4 first paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the tackifying resin (hydrocarbon resin) at a point of the extruder downstream the initial section in the method by Plamthottam et al. in view of Tynan because Burbank et al. teach adding tack resin downstream the initial section reduces viscosity differential (see p. 3 last paragraph).

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments, see page 5 line 3-8, filed 22 July 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-3 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon

further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of different interpretation of the previously applied reference. See above.

19. Applicant's remaining arguments, to the extent these would be applicable to the new grounds of rejection, have been considered but are not persuasive:

20. Applicant argues that any combination of teachings of Tynan with Plamthottam et al. would be possible only with impermissible hindsight.

21. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

22. Applicant argues that Plamthottam et al. and Burbank et al. teach away from the process of the present invention.

23. In response to applicant's argument that "adhesive formulation which is dissolved in a solvent" is formed, "thus solving the problem of rendering easy the successive spreading thereof on a support.", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

24. Additionally, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., an "adhesive formulation which is dissolved in a solvent") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN SCHIFFMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-7626. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9AM until 4PM.

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHRISTINA JOHNSON can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BENJAMIN SCHIFFMAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 4191

/Christina Johnson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791